UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Can Unitarianism Become a Universal Religion?
Kenneth L. Patton

Prolegomena to World War III
Robert S. Hoagland

Should We Believe in Freedom and Justice?
L. A. Ware

Remarkable Indian Custom Recalled
Mabel Powers

Fighting Quakers — *E. Stanton Hodgin*

Trumpets on New Horizons
Edited by Lucia Trent

VOLUME CXXIX NUMBER 11

Chicago, January, 1944

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Robert S. Hoagland: Minister of the Unitarian Society of Fort Wayne, Indiana.

E. Stanton Hodgin: Formerly minister of Unitarian churches in Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and New Bedford; now living in California.

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

Mabel Powers: Lecturer on Indian life and philosophy; author of *Stories the Iroquois Tell Their Children, The Indian as Peacemaker,* and other books.

L. A. Ware: Professor of Electrical Engineering, University of Iowa; author of a Sanskrit grammar; and student of Indian affairs.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 163
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 166

ARTICLES—
Can Unitarianism Become a Universal Religion?—KENNETH L. PATTON 166
Prolegomena to World War III—ROBERT S. HOAGLAND 168
Should We Believe in Freedom and Justice?—L. A. WARE 171
Remarkable Indian Custom Recalled—MABEL POWERS 173
Fighting Quakers—E. STANTON HODGIN 174

POETRY—
Sermonette—ARTIE E. APPLETON 170

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Their Eyes on the Stars—ALICE WOODWARD 172
His Dirty Sheep—RAYMOND KRESENSKY 172
The Cry Goes Out—JOSEPH HOFFMAN 172

CORRESPONDENCE—
Ethical Culture Emphasis—JEROME NATHANSON 175
Allinson Replies to Yarros—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 175
Moral Relativity and Realism—VICTOR S. YARROS 176
Vision Needed—RUTH RANDALL EDSTROM 176
Need for a Popular Liberal Program—CARL PETERSON 176

THE FIELD—
Western Conference News 162

The Field

Western Conference News

On January 1, 1944, the Reverend Randall S. Hilton, for the past five years minister of the First Unitarian Church, Alton, Illinois, assumed the duties of Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference. Mr. Hilton is the third former minister of the Alton church to become Secretary of the Conference. The other two were the Reverend Wilson M. Backus, Secretary from 1904 to 1908, and Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Secretary from 1919 to 1930. Mr. Hilton was graduated from the University of Chicago in 1932 and from Colgate University, Rochester, New York, in 1934. His first pastorate was in Castine, Maine, where he also served as Secretary of the Maine Unitarian Association.

On Sunday, December 12, the Reverend John W. Cyrus, formerly of Milwaukee and Litchfield Park, Arizona, was installed as minister of The First Unitarian Church of Omaha, Nebraska. The preliminary service was conducted by the Reverend Carl Storm of Lincoln, Nebraska; the installation sermon was preached by the Reverend Jacob Trapp of Denver, Colorado; the act of installation on behalf of the church was performed by Mr. Roman L. Hruska, Chairman of the Board; the charge to the minister and to the congregation was given by Dr. Curtis W. Reese.

The Reverend John Brogden, minister of the Unitarian Church of Urbana, Illinois, from 1931 to 1943, is now minister of the First Unitarian Society of Spokane, Washington. Urbana extended a call to the Reverend Philip Schug who was graduated from the Chicago Theological Seminary in 1942, and Mr. Schug began his pastorate December 1.

Miss Leona Handler, for the past two years director of religious activities of The Unitarian Society of Lawrence, Kansas, has been succeeded by Dr. Homer Jack. The call to Doctor Jack was extended in October and he began his pastorate November 15.

The Reverend George W. Marshfield has resigned the pastorate of the People's Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and will pursue graduate studies at the University of Minnesota.

The Reverend Wallace W. Robbins of St. Paul has been elected to the Presidency of the Meadville Theological School, to succeed Dr. Sydney B. Snow. Mr. Robbins was minister of the First Unitarian Church, Alton, Illinois, from 1935 to 1938, and has been minister of Unity Church of St. Paul, Minnesota, since 1938.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIX JANUARY, 1944 No. 11

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

It is a commentary on the nature of the times in which we live that we groan rather than cry out in joy as we witness the passing of the old year and the coming of the new. This now is the fourth New Year since this war began, and still the fighting goes on and stark misery walks ever more terribly the earth. Nothing can redeem the tragedy of this hour, it seems to me, but the high resolution to use this New Year for the restoration of peace to men.

> Ring out the thousand wars of old,
> Ring in the thousand years of peace,

wrote Tennyson many seasons ago on a New Year's Eve. And if he were here today, he would add our present war to the thousand gone, and pray that it be rung out with them forever. How peace can come by the continuance of battle to the bitter end, I cannot see. Yet the majority of men today see the road to peace leading only through the gates of victory, or "unconditional surrender" of the enemy, as we now call it. My vision may be blind or distorted, but I can see a complete victory of arms, won at the last gasp of our foemen's life and hope, bringing us only to a collapse which will prostrate all our efforts after good, and a bitterness of hatred and despair which can lead only to another and final war. We will be ruined along with the beaten enemy—ruined physically, morally, and spiritually. No one can win a war thus fought until one or the other combatant drops helpless to the ground. Only death follows in the wake of such a war—death to our bodies and to our souls! Peace comes in other ways. Its open gates are pity, reconciliation, good will. We can find peace only if we look for it, possess it only if we lay hold upon it. If this New Year is to be anything more than one more of the myriad new years which have brought us, step by step, to this utter horror of a world in arms against itself, to destroy itself, then it must be dedicated to real efforts after peace. Those efforts need not be aimless—they can be pointed, straight and sure, at the mutual interests of mankind which peoples, everywhere weary of this war, would eagerly, exultingly embrace. Give the peoples a chance! Let the governments get out of the way, and ask the peoples themselves to take a hand—and we would have a peace conference tomorrow!

II

A case immediately in point here is the decision of the Cairo Conference in the matter of Japan. This is a truly dreadful piece of news. It holds no hope for mankind in either the war or the peace that is to follow the war. In pronouncing such a Carthaginian doom upon Japan, the Conference insures that the fight in the Pacific will continue to the last bitter end of struggle. With such conditions of defeat before them, the Japanese will battle on until there is left no soldier alive upon the stricken islands. The war, that is, will continue indefinitely and the cost in American lives and money will be beyond all calculation. If the leaders of the United Nations—in this case the United States, Britain, and China—desired to win the war against Japan and end it at the earliest possible moment, why did they not offer terms humane enough to woo acceptance from the enemy? How could they conceive that the terms actually laid down, which carry Japan back to the days of Commodore Perry, could do anything other than steel every last man, woman, and child in the Empire to resistance to the very death? No more fatal blow to the swift progress of this war can be imagined than this so blindly struck by the allied conferees in Cairo. As for the peace after the war, how is it possible to conceive of this arrangement lasting for any considerable period of time? The Japanese are a rapidly multiplying people. The old problem of population and its subsistence will arise in the future, exactly as it did in the past, to upset and in the end destroy any peace based upon subjection. The wise men of Cairo propose to confine the Japanese to their own little set of islands, which is like trying to force a gallon of milk into a quart measure, or to confine an exploding bomb to its own original shell case. This is not to say that Korea shall be denied her independence, or China the recovery of her lost provinces. It is very definitely to say that Japan shall be included in an Asiatic world

in which all the peoples of that vast continent shall be united in the common interest of the common welfare. As it is, Japan is to be cast into the pit—and held there until her writhings rend the earth again. What we have in this Cairo agreement is the assurance that British and American imperialism is going to try to dominate this world after the war is won. If this means a durable peace, then it will be something new in the history of the human race.

III

There are so many horrors in this war that they can scarce be counted, but some loom more dreadful than others. Five of these horrors seem to be chief among them all. (1) One, certainly, is Hitler's deliberate extermination of the Jews of Europe. It is estimated that some two millions have already been destroyed, and that four millions are trapped in occupied territory and are there awaiting death. Nothing like this has been seen before, even in the history of the Jews themselves. The resolution now before Congress empowering the President to appeal to neutral nations to establish rescue camps and to the Axis satellites to expedite the emigration of their Jewish subjects, should be promptly passed. And always there remains Palestine as a refuge which should not be denied. (2) A second unmitigated horror is the progressive starvation of European populations, especially in the occupied countries. How many million men, women, and children have already starved nobody knows, but it is conservatively estimated that, failing effective relief, not less than 30,000,000 will surely perish. Perhaps, if the war continues unduly, the total dead will reach the colossal figure of 50,000,000. The responsibility here is twofold: First, it lies with Germany, which has systematically looted every country which it has invaded, of food as well as of everything else; and secondly, it lies with Britain and America which have maintained a blockade impenetrable to relief. What could be done, without aiding the Nazis, has been shown in Greece, thanks to the intervention of Turkey. Why not elsewhere? (3) The third great horror of this hour is the Indian Famine. Little news can filter through the iron censorship which shuts off India from contact with the world, but the India League reports that the streets of Calcutta are lined with dead bodies, and that in Bengal alone the deaths from starvation have reached the hideous total of 100,000 a week. Responsibility is easy to assess. It lies with the British Raj which made no effort to forestall food shortages, and has not yet undertaken to import food from abroad. But the important question is action *now* to prevent a major and inexcusable calamity. (4) Fourth among these contemporary horrors I name the bombing of civilian populations. The fact that this bombing is now done by the Allies in Germany instead of by the Nazis in England does not alter in the slightest degree its utterly atrocious character. Thus do we sink to the moral level of our enemies, and become savages with them! Yet this is only a part of war, dictated by grim "military necessity." As long as we have war, we will have these horrors. Which brings me to my last horror, which is chief among them all! (5) This horror is War itself.

IV

Zion's Herald republishes from the Manchester (N. H.) *Union* a rather remarkable statement on conscientious objectors by Francis Grover Cleveland, youngest son of the former President. It seems that a correspondent of the *Union* criticized the conscientious objectors in this war, in what I suppose was the usual ignorant, bitter, and intolerant spirit of condemnation. Mr. Cleveland, himself not a C. O., was moved to reply, and he did a complete job. Pointing out what should be obvious, that it takes courage of a high order to "resist the pomp and circumstance of war, mass psychology, hysteria, and all the accoutrements which drive us into war, against a lifetime of better judgment," he continues as follows:

> To be a conscientious objector you must have a courage of soul tenfold deeper than the courage of fighting, for you are answering a still, small voice. All your young life, quietly and without ballyhoo, you have lived according to a certain theory, which puts love of your fellow men and love of God above any other love which may be thrust upon you. There is no furlough from this conscience, nor are there any exemptions to its application. Truly, these young men cannot fight for their freedom within your meaning of the word "fight." For what is their freedom if they lose their souls to keep it?

I am publishing this statement in this place not because the readers of UNITY need it, but just for its own sake as a source of enlightenment and comfort, and as a means also of preserving it. It strikes me as being pretty near a classic interpretation of the inner reality of the spirit which is involved in this amazing phenomenon of conscientious objection to war in the midst of war. It is a perfect answer to the silly challenges that are flung by shallow souls at the C. O.'s—"Would you lie down and let Hitler conquer this country?" "Would you surrender your freedom to his tyranny?" Mr. Cleveland states the whole of it—that the conscientious objector lives in a world—and it was the world that Jesus was talking about!—in which freedom and slavery no longer have the meaning ordinarily attached to these words. Slavery is not slavery if the soul is free of fear and hatred and subjection; and freedom is not freedom if, in order to defend it, you use the force and violence which destroy its values. The conscientious objector will not lose his soul to gain the whole world of material and temporal things, for the soul is the only evidence he has of that Kingdom of God, to which he has pledged his utter allegiance. That Kingdom does not need swords and bombs for its preservation. It asks only the service of men's hearts. "The sword conquers

for a while," says Sholem Asch, in *The Apostle,* "but the spirit conquers forever."

V

There are things that get on my nerves these days. It takes discipline to contain myself as I see the inanities and insanities that men are apparently willing to put up with. (1) This vitamin craze, for example! That there are such things as vitamins, I have no doubt. That they enter into the general composition of health and happiness is altogether likely. But that we must devour them in hazard of life and death, that everything from doughnuts to dog biscuit must be tested and judged from the standpoint of their vitamin content, that vitamins (whatever they are!) must determine our whole diet economy, all this is nonsense of the first order. People eat vitamin pills today in exactly the same way in which they used to wear amulets and charms, and for the same reason—pure superstition! What we have in this vitamin racket is the commercialization of a fad. And the people fall for it. (2) Vitamins in particular suggest radio advertising in general, which is another thing that gets on my nerves. Why the price of listening to a lecture, or a song recital, or a symphony concert, or a vaudeville entertainment, should be this assault upon our ears of platitudinous encomiums of cosmetics, lotions, digestive tablets, laxatives, hair tonic, beers and wines, chewing gums, cigarettes, and tooth pastes, is more than I can understand. Are radio listeners so foolish as to believe this frothy stuff, or so weak as to succumb to it? Just a week or two of a genuine buyers' strike would end it all. And yet it goes right on! Perhaps we deserve the punishment we get. (3) Another thing that gets on my nerves is all this public excitement over the diminishing supply of liquor and the exorbitant prices at which these bottled goods are being sold. I don't know about other cities, but in New York the newspapers carry scare headlines on the front pages, as though this booze problem were a matter of large and vital public interest. Why one would think that the winning or losing of the war hung on tomorrow's price of whiskey! What is involved here, of course, is the question not of the general welfare at all. If every last drop of liquor disappeared from the market tomorrow, the nation would only be immeasurably the gainer. It's profits that stir up all the excitement—the "cut" that manufacturers, retailers, shippers, advertising agents and newspapers all get from the trade. It's disgusting—all this talk of booze at such a time as this, and it shakes my nerves with shame. (4) Lastly, there's the political situation! The administration playing politics with every policy and measure from the tax bill to the newspaper subsidy bill, and the opposition matching trick with trick, and wager with wager. This is democracy at its worst—and it shakes my nerves as I face the year ahead.

VI

Books Abroad, an international quarterly, published some time ago a symposium on "The World's Worst Book." The selections for this high dishonor are made by persons of distinction, many of them authors and critics, and some please me immensely. What a joy, for example, to find James Joyce's *Ulysses* labeled for what it is—the most putrid mass of stupid and irrational egomania ever put by pen to paper! How grand, also, to find Herman Melville's *Moby Dick* conspicuous on the list—the worst jumble of long-winded and undigested literary material ever put between the covers of a book. Melville had a great idea—an epic right in his hands—and did not know what to do with it. Other delightful choices are Milton's *Paradise Regained,* Goethe's *Sorrows of Werther,* Proust's *Swann's Way,* Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain,* Pater's *Marius the Epicurean,* Lawrence's *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom,* and of course Hitler's *Mein Kampf.* To these are added Gertrude Stein and Henry James' later novels. Certain other choices seem so amazing as to be grotesque —Dante's *Divine Comedy,* for example, Cervantes' *Don Quixote,* Milton's *Paradise Lost,* Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus,* Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun,* Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles,* and Shelley's poems—masterpieces if there ever were any masterpieces! Other choices set me thinking hard—Charles Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth,* for example, which I have always heard tooted as a masterpiece, but have never been sure. Then there is Nietzche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra,* named as a "worst book" by Lewis Browne. There are extraordinary passages in this work, and it must be remembered that it inspired Richard Strauss' glorious tone-poem, but most of it I have found unreadable. Babette Deutsch names *Faust*—a judgment that rightly applies to the second part of that poem, well called Goethe's "waste-basket," but is not the first part a towering achievement? Here is a contributor who says he has never been able to read *The Three Musketeers,* another who bans "emphatically" Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* as "sentimental and melodramatic," another who denounces *Gone With the Wind,* "if the remaining pages were anything like the first two." What kind of people are these? The most amazing selection, it seemed to me, was George Herbert's *The Temple.* This may not be the greatest poem ever written, but surely it is not "a dreadful mass of puerile doggerel." One innocent I hate to see suffer—namely, Longfellow's *Hiawatha.* Why pick on this? On the whole, the symposium is a mixture of good and bad judgment, with many a long-nurtured grudge at last vented with welcome exultation.

Jottings

The General Patton episode was shocking, but we see no reason for drawing inferences about the brutality of military life. The fact that the General struck a hospitalized soldier became instantly a vast sensation just because that's what American commanding officers do not do.

A recent exhibition of cartoons in New York was advertised as "showing the lighter side of war." It's nice to be told that there is a "lighter side of war," but it sounds to me like speaking of the cooler side of hell.

Joseph Klausner's *From Jesus to Paul* had scarcely appeared when Sholem Asch's *The Apostle* was published. Here are the two greatest studies of St. Paul in our time, and both written by Jews!

On a certain Sunday in New York recently, sermons were preached on such subjects as the following: "The Birds of Noah," "The Face in the Mirror," "The Altar That Joshua Built," "Samson the Weakling," and "What God Knows About You." Is this the reason why people don't go to church? No!—for it is in the churches where such sermons are preached that people *do* go to church. Think it out for yourself!

A severe earthquake in Turkey is reported to have killed 600 people. But this is poor pickings as compared with the deaths in a single bombing in this war. Nature is a feeble competitor of man in this business of destruction.

Sir Oswald Mosley, the Fascist, is released from prison in England, while Gandhi and Nehru remain in prison in India. As a comment on certain aspects of the present world situation, this contrast outdoes anything that a Nazi propagandist could offer.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Can Unitarianism Become a Universal Religion?

KENNETH L. PATTON

Unitarianism could become a universal religion, but the chances are that it will not, at least not for a long time if it ever does. In appraising the merits of Unitarianism for survival and growth we should first ask ourselves what it is. I see in it four main aspects.

Unitarianism early espoused the idea of the unity of God, which has since grown in some quarters into the concept of the unity of nature, in which the universe is seen as a self-including whole of interrelated causes and effects, and all parts coextensive with all others. It is a world amenable in all its parts to reason, understanding, and investigation.

Unitarianism admits of great variation within itself without violence to its integrity as a movement. There are those who call themselves "theists of the theists," and others who are enticed by a faint aroma of theism. Others are completely convicted of naturalism and Humanism.

Perhaps the predominant characteristic, which makes the second aspect a possibility, is that it is a congregation of free minds with complete religious and intellectual democracy. It holds to faith in discussion, free competition and exchange of ideas, and generally a nondogmatic attitude toward beliefs.

The last is similar to the third, a bent toward agnosticism, a willingness to withold final judgment as to those beliefs unavailable to proof.

We can ask if the time will ever come when all people would be satisfied with the tentativeness, the nondogmatic atmosphere of such a faith. Are some congenitally predisposed to certainty, timid, needing a shelter and comfort not herein offered? Is belief in God an instinct, or inherent need, in man? Is the frame of mind arising out of traditional Christianity an absolute and inevitable condition of human nature? That is the position taken by Christian anthropologists and psychologists, holding to Jesus as the perfect norm in human character and the normativeness of the Christian doctrines. They are the previous, *a priori* fact. Man was created in the likeness of the Christian God and we can have no rest or peace until we find our wholeness within the will and person of this God. It is claimed that the essence of religion is in theistic belief, in the working out in history of God's absolute moral principles, in the spiritual reality of the universe, in the domination of the soul over the body, in the unreality of the material world, in belief in and aspiration to immortality.

The inevitable outcome of such religion is the division of the world and life into the sacred and the secular. This dualism, in my opinion, is the most dangerous and subversive idea in religious thought and practice. It is divisive of the reality of living experience, and it is sterile in that it delimits the area of religious experience and control and disparages, if it does not contaminate, large and important areas of human experience.

Happily there are competing ideas as to what constitutes religion. One is represented by A. E. Haydon who says that the basic drive in religion is the quest for the good life and it is common to all religions in man's history: ". . . religion itself was never a mystery. It was a practical and prescribed way of behavior; the safe way of living. It had its roots in the rich soil of natural, human hungerings."

Social psychology has given an answer to those who claim that faith in the existence and beneficence of a personal, heavenly power is native and indispensable to men. It has shown that almost all, if not all, of the

specific forms which our thought and desires take are learned and conditioned by our fellows and our environment; they are not born into us. Even if there is a God, we should have to learn to love him, just as we have to learn to love our parents. For those brought up in a world in which the existence of God is taken for granted as the foremost and indisputable fact of life, it may seem to be an inevitable and indispensable element of human consciousness and devotion, but it is not. It is an acquired taste, and one can just as easily be brought up to react against theism as to react to it.

Evidence for this lies not alone in the social sciences and research into human nature, but in the evidence of history and ethnic studies. There have been, and still are, vigorous religions that eventuate in high morality and satisfy their devotees emotionally and devotionally, which have no God concept. Examples are found in Jainism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. These religions had their world views and incentives to moral and spiritual struggle. There are many other available centers for emotional evaluation, such as home, family, business, country, lodge, wife, mother, friends. The idea of God does not have any peculiar priority or universality. Those groups which have no idea of God have attached their emotional appreciations to other things. The example of millions of people living fairly happy lives for hundreds of years without the idea of God would seem to blunt somewhat the assertion that such a devotion is a universal instinct and necessity for humanity.

As to whether men can live ably in a world of "maybes," the answer is that they do already. It has been said that we can put up with anything that is inevitable; we can put up with even more things that are not. There is no one who can be absolutely sure that we will win this war, but we are all willing to take the chance. The preachers are saying very little about God being on our side this time, so we must feel that we are on our own. When David faced Goliath it is said that he *knew* he would triumph because God was back of him. It is enlightening that even in theistic Israel David seems to have been the only Hebrew soldier who was quite that sure. Even David decided to make very careful preparations, discarding Saul's heavy armor, choosing his stones carefully, and picking a mode of attack in which he had great skill. He may not have lacked faith in God, but he evidently gave God, and himself, every break possible. We do not act as if such things were certainties, no matter what we say. It has been said that the good Mohammedan believes that all things are in the hands of Allah and acts accordingly. If he is to die he will die; if he is to live he will live. Therefore, he can be utterly fearless because he cannot be killed unless Allah has willed it, and if Allah has willed him to die he could not prevent it if he would. As M. C. Otto has pointed out, logically there can be no one but atheists in fox holes. The believer would need no fox hole for protection; he could trust in the Almighty.

It is evident that we do live in a world of chance and that we take all available opportunities to load the dice in our direction. To him who asks if Unitarianism, or, as in my own case, naturalism, can be a universal religion, I would answer, "Isn't it already? Isn't it as universal a religion as the world has yet seen right here and now?" What is the real religion of the Protestants and Catholics? It is not what they profess but what they do, and that is secularism and Humanism, almost unrelievedly. Some hearts are comforted by belief in divine presence and perhaps some souls are restrained from temptation by a faint scent of brimstone on the nether wind, but by and large people act practically and with utilitarian motives. They do what they do because it seems to work best, and they do not leave anything for divine aid which they can do for themselves. They seldom call upon God to do even the things they cannot do for themselves. Their practical actions evidence an utter skepticism as to God intervening into natural forces to bring about any assistance of any kind. This is a tacit assumption in a great deal of teaching and preaching in many churches, by far the most of them not Unitarian. Unitarianism is on its way to becoming a universal religion, only now it is called by all kinds of names.

If this is true, why should we bother to try to universalize Unitarianism or naturalism? The answer is that we believe there is something to be gained, both in effectiveness and individual integrity, if a man is intelligently and honestly aware of the real religion by which he lives. It is not good for our personalities and mental health to profess one thing and do another, even if the practice is better than the creed. One's religion should be much more effective, more powerful, if it is understood and worked upon and consciously generated.

There is little reason to hope that this universalization can be brought about. The reason lies in the tremendous investment of money, ambition, sentiment, property, prestige, and habit in the orthodox faiths. The defenses of the old faiths are marvels of sophistry, rationalization, and intellectual contortion. They will continue to be so. Dogmatism will fight to the last preacher and the last prayer meeting. They will continue the policy of compromise and concession and alteration. More and more they will have nothing left but the name of God, nothing but the pomp and pageantry of the old faith. The rest, the real, living, vital part of their religion, will be good Unitarianism and naturalism, but they will probably not be gracious enough to admit it. Some will; many will not.

Conservative churches are and will be very intelligent and progressive in utilizing psychology and education to perpetuate themselves. As long as the Catholic Church has its members from the cradle through graduate school, there is little that can be done about their beliefs. Even so, Catholics are becoming increasingly impotent to control any important sphere of action among their members. The priests' ranting about birth control reminds me of the sermons our Methodist minister used to preach against dancing, smoking, drinking, and card playing when I was a boy, and it is just about as effective.

Being fairly sure that all that stands between humanity and a naturalistic faith is the conditioning of our backward culture, it could become a universal religion in one generation—*if*. That *if* is the complete control over homes and education. Since this could not be done short of dictatorship and the curtailment of religious liberties, it would mean the abandonment of the very faith which Unitarianism avows. Therefore, we will have to bide our time and let our religion prove itself practically and effectively in life. It does not concern us ultimately what it is called so long as it is practiced. As long as the other churches will practice my Humanism, I will tolerate their theism, but if

they will not cooperate on practical programs for human betterment I will fight them all the way from their heaven to their hell and let them choose the weapons.

The evidence seems to be that if there is ever to be a universal religion it will be naturalism. The reason that the Protestant churches have grown so close together of late as to be practically indistinguishable is that they have become increasingly liberal and humanistic. In the practical program of working toward the good life, almost all peoples and religions can now cooperate. This war is being fought against those religions that refuse to cooperate and hold to supernaturalistic faiths which elevate them above common humanity and lead them to exploit the common search for a better world.

No single brand of theism or dogmatism will ever be a universal religion. There is no common ground on which men can get together when intuition, mysticism, and revelation are held as ultimate authorities. But science and technology are universal languages. A threshing machine will thresh wheat for the speakers of any language and you can swear at it in any religion. Mathematics, test-tubes, and sulfanilamide can straddle cultural and religious barriers as if they were nonexistent. This is our big advantage. We do not have to preach and proselyte; all we have to do is demonstrate. The tide is irrepressibly in our direction. But mankind is a slow-moving, unwieldy body, and this will not be a universal faith tomorrow. It does have within it the greatest pliability and growth potential. It does carry within it the wave of the future. If there is ever a universal religion, it will grow out of the type of faith we are advancing.

Prolegomena to World War III

ROBERT S. HOAGLAND

In a searing thrust of prophetic eloquence, the *Protestant* has just warned editorially in its November issue that the refusal of "Progressives" to get together on liberal aims is "leading us headlong to World War III before we have won World War II." This theme is now erupting so frequently into the liberal consciousness that it seems time to pass on to others the results of a little academic chore I have been doing. The results will serve as some kind of a belated warning to non-cooperative progressives.

Just a few days after the Atlantic Charter was published in August, 1941, I said in a public address that I feared some day we would be able to set the beginning of Chapter III of this World Revolution in the Atlantic Charter. The causes of war are involved obscurely in a long historical process. It is therefore possible to name almost any date as the beginning of a particular war. But it seemed from what I knew, both from personal experience and reading, of that ill-defined evil, imperialism, that critical economic and psychological maladjustments in the world were guaranteed perpetuation by two points in the Charter. The continuance of such maladjustments means the abortion of the world revolution so long in gestation. And thus, new wars.

It seemed that in Point Four the parenthetical "with due respect for their existing obligations" was not just a disarming concession to referential language in a singularly formal document, but was a keenly calculated alibi in a future which might point an accusing finger at the bankruptcy of the "Peoples' War" into an extension of the age-old exploitation of helpless peoples.

And I felt that Point Eight set up an artificial division of the peoples of the world into categories of saints and sinners. Such an arbitrary division has no moral roots in history; and thus it could not fail to nurture resentment in the "sinners," a resentment which would be transfused into lust for vengeance, and the lust for vengeance would be a prelude to disaster.

Anyhow, from August, 1941, on, I watched curiously for references to World War III in books and all kinds of periodicals.

Of course, before August 14, 1941, there was a great deal of writing which warned about such a trend as that now prophetically noted in the *Protestant*. There was such an infrequent bit as Carleton Beals' *Pan-America*. In general, the gloom came mostly from the two most vocal sections of far-left Marxism. In one section Earl Browder, as early as May, 1940, was intoning prophecies of continued disaster if our ideals remained tarnished. His staff sergeant, V. J. Jerome, did a good job of seconding the leader with some potent sesquipedalian thunder. The other section carried its "defeatism" right on past June, 1941. You will find top-flight examples in *Living Marxism* in the Fall of 1941. The general trend of all this stuff is in the words that Lincoln Steffens claims Clemenceau hurled at Lloyd George and Wilson in 1919, that we could not have our cake and eat it too; for peace ". . . we must give up our empires and all hope of empire."

Pacifists added their word; and Drew Pearson appointed himself a committee of one to correct them, as he did in his "smearing" of Harry Emerson Fosdick. Catholic clerics put in their say. February 9, 1941, for example, Father John A. O'Brien reported that he saw "the seeds of another war being sown." The clerics did not do much about it on the surface, but the Marxists established magazines to preach their angle: *U. S. Week, Friday, et al.*

As early as April, 1941, such journalists as Dorothy Thompson were criticizing the British for not stating their peace aims. Professor Albert Viton, of Northwestern University, was detecting trends aimed at perpetuating the pre-war order.

First references to World War III did not audaciously label it that. September 21, 1941, Archbishop Samuel A. Stritch said, "Already we can foresee that

certain disruptive forces will fight at the peace table for greed and advantage. . . ." The *United States News* decided that "the war is basically fought to determine who is to have the privilege of pushing other people around." To this conclusion the *Christian Century* sighed a pious "Amen!"

In a few weeks Colonel Knox was calling for a world to be ruled for a hundred years by overwhelming British-American naval power. On Thanksgiving Day Raymond Clapper got reckless and bellowed we must conclude "that we would have to go on fighting for freedom, presumably in a succession of world wars." Just as December 7 approached, Clapper was peeved again and complained that the "administration is showing little interest in anything more than a 'lick Hitler' goal." The *Progressive* clappered also that the President "was engaged in a great venture to save the life of yesterday while the people were far more interested in building a better tomorrow."

Then polite silence; patriotic silence!

But in six weeks the *Christian Century* was forecasting a perpetuation of the *status quo ante bellum* as the outcome of the war. President Benes bluntly advanced a proposal which meant just that for Europe. And the Chicago *Sun* (*mirabile dictu!*) proposed that Archduke Otto be recognized by the United States as the leader of a "Free Austro-Hungarian" movement.

A month later Editor Luce was heralding to his millions of faithfuls a future control of Asia which would give American investors four, yes, five, yea, ten billions of dollars a year. And Wendell Willkie, from a Joe Louis fistic ring, cried extempore, "American democracy will rule the world." Dr. Felix Morley found the pitch and insisted that FDR had confused the people by his refusal to emphasize the revolutionary pattern of the war. Pundit de Sales, in his new book, wondered if a better world *was* coming. And Clifton Fadiman called for hate as a way to build the new world. Louis Fischer, in *Dawn of Victory,* was contradictorily regretting that the British aim was the *status quo* of days of yore. But the Unitarian Service Committee *Bulletin* found that the war was "against those who would force on an unwilling humanity the heresy that one man is good enough to be another's master."

An article in UNITY (March, 1942) argued that Union Now meant World War III, setting the stage for new opposing line-ups. Daladier, in his "trial" in Riom, was promising that France would not be beaten by Germany in the next war.

Several months passed and Ernest K. Lindley was whispering to us that one of the post-war objectives of the United Nations was "the prevention of revolutions in vanquished countries." And *Common Sense* worried because there could be no lasting peace in Europe if the German people were denied a part in it. Lord Halifax had assured us that the Allied Peace Terms for Germany would be more harsh "this time." Harold Laski countered with the charge that Churchill did not want to "touch the foundations of our society."

Theodore Dreiser got into very hot water in Canada for making unkind remarks about the possible future reactionary world. But Frances Gunther fearlessly said that if the Indians lose their revolution we lose. Ditto UNITY. While Dreiser wailed that he was "the No. 1 victim of the Four Freedoms," E. Stanley Jones agreed with Mrs. Gunther and said that by the only signs he saw we were "fighting to restore the *status quo* in the Pacific." H. A. Overstreet thought it timely to bring his word of warning, saying that the world does not want to be made over in the image of the United States.

One of the first specific references to World War III was in the *Christian Century* of October 14, 1942. About the same time Avery O. Craven was arguing in the *University of Chicago Magazine* that this war was our last chance to give justice to the East. Hoover and Gibson were warning against a new form of *Pax Romana.* In his able book, Professor and London *Times* Editor Carr investigated the conditions necessary "if Great Britain is to play a predominant role in Europe and the world" in the future.

On November 10, Churchill for the first time emphasized: "We mean to hold our own." Even the incorrigibly optimistic Senator Pepper worried about this enunciation of British policy. And Louis Fischer began to say in speeches: "We might already be preparing for World War III." A writer in the effusive Chicago *Sun* asked, "Are we beginning to lose the peace?" And Milton Mayer groaned that Churchill had struck the hardest of all blows against the United Nations.

As a reminder to the politicoes, Harry Emerson Fosdick preached: "This is not just another war; this is a world-revolution." But on December 2, Anthony Eden came to the support of Churchill by telling how the Allied Nations were going to restrict for all time the "aggressive power" of Japan and Germany.

In nostalgia for the good old days, liberal editors began to agonize about our collaboration with Fascists. And Pearl Buck, speaking to Nobel Prize Winners, fired a blast heard at least twice around the world. She lamented that apparently another World War must be fought for freedom: "unless there is a miracle we will have to fight another war to save freedom." She still hoped for a breathing space between the two wars; but she was not certain of that.

Probably as a Christmas token to the readers, a writer in the Chicago *Sun* typed his observation that the trend "betrays the breeding of another and more terrible war." Some nine hundred miles east, usually cantankerous Quincy Howe calculated that ". . . to prevent another war like this from breaking out we shall have to train all our young people to bear arms." But E. Stanley Jones believed that all we had to do to avoid "another war" was to extend the Atlantic Charter to the entire world.

The gloom rapidly got thicker. As the new year opened, Frank Lloyd Wright sized things up and found that we were heading "for an empty victory." The gospel of expediency was destroying us. Even the *Christian Register,* famous for rose-colored glasses, began to wonder: "Is This Our Peace?" (A century or a millennium of American rule of the world.) The *New Republic* got profoundly jaundiced and said that the way things were going, in its "considered judgment," we may achieve military victory, followed perhaps by "the third World War." There was a hesitant reference to War III in the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* while the Chicago *Sun* spread in large point: "Knox For Lasting Pacific Control." Senator LaFollette got the echoes and envisioned us heading for a vindictive peace which would breed World War III.

Common Sense had just reasoned that, with current conditions in the British Cabinet being what they were,

when the war is won, "preparations would immediately begin for World War III." William Henry Chamberlin added his bit of worrying about World War III. And Shirley Graham wrote, "Negroes are fighting for Freedom. If we fail to realize this the seeds of World War III will have been sown."

References to World War III became commonplace. Even conservatives (or worse) began to fear it. Churchill's talk of Sunday, March 21, 1943, led David Lawrence to prophesy Chapter III. Dorothy Thompson got slightly off the track and found in the declaration of a friend what many were thinking: ". . . if we bought this war in a department store, we would send it back, on the ground that it wasn't ordered, didn't fit, wasn't becoming, and was already sagging." Harold Laski again courageously warned that the next generation would pay for Churchill's neglect of war aims. Dr. van Loon now expressed his skepticism concerning the making of a "bright new world"—and did so in the Unitarian *Christian Register*. Lin Yutang grew more bitter, and said: "I never thought that the second World War would show no signs of making people think away from imperialism and power politics. Perhaps a third World War will do it."

Common Sense discovered "the most likely single cause of a third World War in another decade or two" in the reactionary nature of our State Department. Norman Angell, arguing "Let the People Know," wonders if the "kid, now crawling in his rompers, will be haled off in twenty-five years' time to fight World War No. 3." Harry Elmer Barnes digested all the print available and came up with the summary: "Many are expressing the fear that the third World War may break out before the second comes to an end." And Pearl Buck explained to the Socialists that she did not mean in her Nobel dinner speech that *even* a third World War could achieve freedom. "Wars do not achieve freedom." Another writer took refuge in quoting Plato: ". . . victory has been and will be suicidal to the victors."

Bruce Bliven went deeper and deeper into a blackout of optimism. But the British were looking far ahead. On July Fourth, Ernest Bevin told the American Society of London that it should not be assumed that Germany calculated on winning World War II. "She did calculate that she would bleed her enemies so white in two world wars that the third might possibly be a triumphant one for her."

Alexander Meiklejohn bore testimony that wars will continue until we "rebuild the basic principle of reasonableness." Gaetano Salvemini hit rock bottom of disillusionment. Fred Rodell of Yale went along with him, but bounced a bit higher. Norman Thomas got so weary of it all, that he almost forgot to talk. In the midst of all this ethical moroseness, the *Nation's* and *PM's* I. F. Stone came through with a jewel: "Churchill is still the 1890 imperialist." And the *World Observer* declared that Britain wants one of two things: to be spared a third World War or to be given an infallible partner. This was not news to George Seldes and his *In Fact*.

John T. Flynn saw things as a Prologue to Fascism. Max C. Otto asked: How can we know that the State Department and the British Foreign Office want popular government elsewhere if not in Italy? Doctor Lin again got petulant and in a most un-Confucian calm roared: "In the brief space of four days at the end of July. . . [our leaders] may have made a third World War certain." Maybe because certain psychiatrists were finding Germany "incurable," Governor Dewey came out, far from *sotto voce*, for an Anglo-American alliance. Socialist George Bernard Shaw opined that Stalin would keep the world sane; but Socialist Norman Thomas saw the sad key in the fact that Churchill wants the United States to underwrite the British Empire.

Louis Fischer again started around the lecture circuit and made his gospel: Unless we plan a Democratic World, World War III will come. Doctor Lin, head bloody but unbowed, nominated Churchill to be the Metternich of his day. Max C. Otto refreshed himself by looking ahead to the hundredth anniversary of the *Origin of Species*, beginning, however, pensively, "In sixteen years—assuming that World War II is ended and World War III has not yet begun. . . ."

On October 26, Senator Pepper most unkindly roared: "the shadows of World War III stalk in the Senate this afternoon." Pierre van Paassen adequately documented one possible source of World War III. Drew Pearson got bilious because the Atlantic City Food and Rehabilitation Conference seemed to adopt the worst features of the League of Nations.

John Haynes Holmes said that we could tell World War III "has already begun" if conscription is continued after this Chapter II. *Common Sense* began to worry about Chapter III as a race war. And Carlos P. Romulo, in *Mother America*, said that the biggest problem of keeping the peace is avoiding this racial conflict.

Albert Jay Nock, reciting (redundantly for some) how superfluous he is, pulpiteers in limpid prose that we cannot organize the world because we have not even organized the family. The *Saturday Evening Post* seems to agree, and gloats over the success of power politics in Italy, to the caustic pain of the *Nation*. F. A. Voigt, spokesman for the British ruling class as heir to Obiter Dictum Garvin, argues in the *Nineteenth Century and After* that the balance of power "is for Great Britain and the Empire, the immutable condition of survival." Voigt claims that Britain went to war in 1939 only to preserve the balance.

It grew wearisome.

The *Christian Century* mourned that the war will have been fought in vain. David Lawrence celebrated Thanksgiving Day by publishing his view that World War III would come if we sowed hate. Lieut. Gen. George S. Patton had just assured a boy eight years too young for the army, "You can be sure there will be more wars."

Maybe it *is* time for those who believe in the Unity of Mankind to get together!

Sermonette

"You fought and quarreled with little Joe,
Stay home today and play."
"But, Mother, that was long ago—
Why, that was *yesterday!*"

I stood in deep humility
My lips in answer smiled,
I heard our Lord so softly say,
"Except you be as a child."

ARTIE E. APPLETON.

Should We Believe in Freedom and Justice?

L. A. WARE

The world is confronted by "unsolvable" problems. A problem is unsolvable, by definition, when those responsible for its solution are not willing to pay the price. Problems not easily solved are usually subject to the application of principles. One might even go so far as to say that principles will solve any problem, and in the field of international turmoil two principles are applicable: Freedom and Justice. There are those who claim that to solve an international problem it is necessary to work out thousands of details, even as to how much each person is to pay for a pair of shoes. Detailed interference merely sets up new difficulties and, as matters have gone in the past, the attempts to settle these new problems have engendered myriads of new problems and so on *ad infinitum*.

The great enigmas facing the world are almost without number. In every century they have multiplied so that now each person's life is but a precarious existence between and through periods of world cataclysms. The puny, half-hearted attempts made by man to do away with these troubles speak only of his lack of interest in solving the problems facing him. While individuals here and there hope against hope for a cessation of the bloody wars, the facts of history state that the so-called civilized nations of the world seem to have a great love of conflict. Great men may speak of guaranties against aggression but suddenly on auspicious days, periodically spaced along the path of history, wars begin anew,—each time a war which breaks all records in trying to prove that all previous wars were but rehearsals, and poor ones at that. Is it not time that the simplicity of solution by principles should be noted?

Is there any real desire to put a stop to wars and is there any interest, on a wide scale, in seeing oppression of races ended? This is a question that must be answered. It is not a problem. A problem only arises when someone has decided to do something. This is a matter of fact, and there are definite answers of "yes" and "no." If the answer is "no," then the solutions to the problems of war, tyranny, and aggression are unnecessary because it merely means that people love war, and trouble in general, and why try to do away with them? If the answer is "yes" then the problems arise of how to bring about the desired world of peace. It has seemed in the past that people have not yet definitely decided whether the answer is "yes" or "no." There are many people who seem to wish for the abolition of war, oppression, and tyranny, but they seem to experience a change of heart when action is necessary. They continue to pray for peace and prepare for war, even as now the world is fighting for peace but laying the firm foundations for a future war which will make this one appear as harmless as a firecracker in the desert.

An answer to a question is needed. No further progress is possible unless it is forthcoming. We have faith in the fact that despite appearances, millions of men and millions of women, soldiers on the battlefield and mothers of soldiers at home, do want peace and in great numbers are willing to do something about it. How can the principle of simplicity be applied to this problem? No doubt wars are caused by oppression on the one hand and greed on the other. In the maneuvering among nations for favored positions, like the steel against the flint, conflagrations are started. In the immediate problems which arise there are many little ills, and there are many doctors who suggest a touch here and a tap there as the way in which to handle the dangerous situation. It is here that care is needed.

Usually the obvious procedure has been always to look out for "number one" and if it is found that number one is losing a little in prestige or suffering a hurt in pride or falling off a little in the yearly balance, the next obvious piece of work is to look to the home armaments, for very likely a war is in the offing. Thus little incidents are skillfully guided into world calamities for which no one will take the blame but in which everyone's hand is burned. Perhaps the simple solution to this is too difficult for the present-day diplomatic mind. In the treatment of minor international, and national, abrasions the two principles of Freedom and Justice followed carefully will lead to surprising results. Let the political doctors note that, though it may be personally distasteful to them, there is in fact a brotherhood of man. Their decisions in all cases need merely conform to the two principles consistent with a brotherhood, that of Freedom and that of Justice. If every decision is based on Justice, above all, and upon Freedom consistent with world welfare, the succeeding problems, which in the normal course of events naturally arise, are much less formidable. The application to them in turn of the same principles soon dissipates their potential fireworks, and very soon it is found that the major problems are nonexistent. The application of the principles of Freedom and Justice naturally leads to successive problems of lesser and lesser gravity,—thus a system which by itself approaches equilibrium. On the other hand if the problems which arise are "solved" by force, by the application of the "fire cure," then new problems come into being which seem not only to require the same treatment but which are much more malignant; and so on until the only possible outcome is a world war which will destroy most of the old system and allow a new start.

One may say that it is all very well to speak so glibly of these "idealistic" solutions to age-old problems, and there are great numbers of persons who are sufficiently pessimistic of the outcome of history to say that, though it is agreed that this is the answer, it can never be applied. If it cannot be applied, which is another way of saying that there is not sufficient interest to apply it, then there is indeed small hope for the world. That it will be applied is certain, but when is perhaps unknown. It can be easily applied to past history in retrospect. It is only necessary to think back over the recent problems of the Spanish Civil War, the conquest of Ethiopia, the invasion of China, the Munich affair, the modern problem of India, and many others. In not one of these illustrations was the principle of Justice or Freedom invoked. In every case it was a matter of either oppression, exploitation, or the refusal of support in a just cause, because of some private or group interest which was opposed to the welfare of man in general.

It may be asked how all this applies to a specific case. Let one example suffice. Consider India, for instance. In the dawn of time India came into being and through thousands of years she represented the repository of

knowledge and civilization for the world. She is indeed the mother of nations. Today one looks to the East and sees India lying in chains. Her freedom is gone and the great debt which the world owes to her is seemingly forgotten. Today famine rages through the land and many of her millions, under the rule of a distant land, are born, live, and die in poverty. They are deprived of the right to look upon themselves as free men in a world which rings with the words of democracy. There are few among the common people of the world who would deny to the 400,000,000 of India the rights which they claim for themselves. There are also few who would refuse to send to her shores the bread which her starving ones need. It is difficult then on the surface of the matter to see why so vast a nation is held in bondage. Surely Justice is due to everyone, even to the lowliest slave. Freedom is the undeniable right of all people and the only argument that is brought against freedom is exploitation, although it may be dressed in many costumes and called by many names. The argument is used that if the control of a powerful government is removed, chaos will result and various factions will rush at the throats of other groups; civil war and religious strife may begin. The question arises as to which chaos is the more to be avoided. It is the undeniable right of a nation to work out its own salvation, and to make agreements with other nations for that purpose if necessary. Oppression of India will lead to continuous war, to continuous internal strife, and to a possible serious antagonism to the nations of the West. The granting of freedom to India, with no conditions attached, accompanied by the friendship of the world democracies may lead momentarily to a turmoil of readjustment. However, the situation is in complete accord with the principle that, if Justice and Freedom are offered to India, the problems within India are greatly simplified and will solve themselves. India takes its place among nations and an effective national pride comes into being. This is an illustration of the progress toward stability. In other words a more stable condition results and the solution of the ensuing problems in the light of the above principles gradually leads to a normally functioning democracy. Such a solution to the problem of India requires the relief of India from every sort of exploitation, from the pressure of foreign ideas, from the discrimination against race and color, and from military occupation except in case of mutual agreement for resistance to a common foe. It requires the offer of aid in time of national need, and a sympathetic appreciation of the contribution of India to whatever is good in modern civilization. If the problem of India is not simple it is because there are powerful groups which do not wish the problem solved.

A review of similar cases, even to the exclusion of the hundreds of others in history, leads one to marvel at the tenacity of these principles to persist in existing in the hearts of men. That they are powerful is evidenced by the fact that after so many centuries of oppression and tyranny they still exist, though admittedly as a flickering flame. There are many who say that, if decisions were based on these principles alone, it would lead to great local uprising and confusion, to say nothing of the loss of sovereignty and the loss of income. It is true that to upset the old system of force and aggression will cause a little friction. This is a major change, but the auxiliary principle of stability guarantees the result. No lasting difficulty can arise out of any solution based on Freedom and Justice to all men.

Trumpets on New Horizons

EDITED BY LUCIA TRENT

Their Eyes on the Stars

Step by step, balancing,
Swollen terror in her feet,
She creeps out on a cold rope,
A tight rope stretched between dizzy peaks,
Freezing, burning.
Not daring to look down
At green valleys or loved hills,
Not daring to remember
Warm breath of trees
Or friends or home
Miles down under.

Children are following—boys, girls,
Their eyes in the heavens,
On the stars,
Her eyes dare not waver,
Her feet dare not tangle,
Dare not slip—
Children are crossing
Sinking quakelands
To a new world.

ALICE WOODWARD.

His Dirty Sheep

In a little park on crooked benches
The bums sit down, and the world goes by
Turning away from the "Devil's stenches"—
Looking for something in the sky.

On a noisy street in a noisy town
The world laughs at the "misfits" there
And thinks that God walks up and down
Their streets with special heavenly care.

In a little park the bums, unknowing
Of God, are tired and half asleep;
God watches while noonday whistles blowing
Disturb no dream of his dirty sheep.

RAYMOND KRESENSKY.

The Cry Goes Out

The cry goes out across the earth
And shall not return
Until the thing is done.
Like an earthquake will it shake
The world and level mountains,
Like a tempest will it roar
Against the bonds of death—
The four winds blast at once,
Tear the hands of death
From the throat of life.

JOSEPH HOFFMAN.

Remarkable Indian Custom Recalled

MABEL POWERS

New Year's is a time for making new resolutions, turning over new leaves, clearing the slates, and beginning again. How completely an Indian people of the Southland carried through such a program, wiping out old scores, and starting life anew, has been recorded by several early travellers and historians, including Adair, Gatschet, and Bartram.

For more than a century before that barbarous and inhuman removal of the Creeks to Indian Territory (Oklahoma) during the administration of Andrew Jackson, some twenty thousand of these people were occupying the Alabama-Georgia section. Their fifty towns were of two kinds: Peace towns in which all civil business and religious ceremonies were conducted, and Red, or War towns that were maintained for war purposes. The White-Peace towns were also held as sanctuaries. Those who had taken life without intent found sanctuary in them, and even willful murderers were safe from primitive law as long as they remained in the town, for blood was never shed in a Peace town.

It was in the public squares of these Peace towns that a remarkable annual New Year Festival was observed called "The Busk." It was one of the most remarkable ceremonials of the North American Indians in that it brought to the people a complete change of mind that was symbolized in various ways.

The New Year of the Creek calendar fell in late July or early August, the time when their harvests had matured. Eight days were required for the celebration of The Busk. On the first day the squares of the White-Peace towns were cleaned and sprinkled with white sand. Then a new council fire was kindled by the fire-maker chief. From this central fire, the women carried some of the sacred embers with which to light their own hearths which had previously been cleaned and sprinkled with white sand.

Much attention was given both to the cleaning of the lodges and the purifying of the minds and bodies of the dwellers. Cleansing potions were brewed and drunk, and the people fasted for three days. Men and women entered into ritual-dances; old garments were cast off and burned with other waste of the household; new clothing was put on; old household utensils were broken and replaced with new ones that had previously been prepared; all debts and offenses were forgiven; a general amnesty was proclaimed; malefactors were permitted to return to their homes exonerated of their crimes, and the ceremonial ended with a great feast.

With The Busk, life began anew, for the observance of the Creek New Year changed the minds of the people and actually brought new physical, mental, and spiritual life and power to them.

What would happen if Americans—and all peoples—today revived but one of these old customs and really forgave one enemy of misunderstanding and one debt? Would not the face and mind of every community be changed by such an act? Would not a new spirit of friendliness and cooperation result?

There is an abundance of good for all peoples. Let us release a little of this good, put it into circulation, by each one of us forgiving at least one enemy of misunderstanding and cancelling one debt on New Year's Day as did those first Americans. It may work so well we will wish to forgive more, and those oft-repeated words, "Forgive us our debts as we have forgiven our debtors," may hold for us a new meaning through 1944.

John Haynes Holmes, Editor **UNITY** Curtis W. Reese, Managing Editor

Published Monthly by Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Illinois

UNITY was established in 1878 as the Pamphlet Mission, and for many years served as the unofficial organ of the Western Unitarian Conference. It now serves as a medium of expression and of critical inquiry for liberals and democratic leaders of thought throughout the United States.

UNITY announces forthcoming articles by:

Kenneth L. Patton of Madison, Wis. **A. Powell Davies of Summit, N. J.**
Jacob Trapp of Denver, Colo. **R. Lester Mondale of Kansas City, Mo.**

Read UNITY and learn what these and other modern-minded men are thinking.

Subscription $1.50

Abraham Lincoln Centre,
700 Oakwood Blvd.
Chicago 15, Illinois.

Enter my subscription to UNITY for one year. ☐ **for which I enclose $1.50.** ☐ **for which bill me in due course.**

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **State** .....

Fighting Quakers

E. STANTON HODGIN

I gladly hail John Haynes Holmes as our most valiant and tireless leader in all humanitarian movements. I fully appreciate how the voluminous flood of his many activities dwarfs my poor little trickle of effort into insignificance. I recognize how trenchantly fitting are many of his indictments of men and movements for their supineness and slothfulness in the face of the exigencies that confront us, and how ably and effectively he presents them.

I am also forced to recognize that he often hurls himself into questions with such emotional impetuosity that he makes statements and accusations that he would not be likely to make if he had time to give them deliberate consideration. A conspicuous lapse of this kind, it seems to me, is seen in his strictures upon the Quakers who are "supporting this war." "Didn't they ever think the question of pacifism through?" he exclaims,—as if thinking such a question through was easy and simple. I doubt any person's ability to think any fundamental question through to a finality. I make no claim to having thought the question of pacifism through, but I am sure that I have penetrated deeply enough into it to see how unjustifiable are the sweeping accusations that he levels at those whom he would call the recalcitrant pacifists.

Doctor Holmes apparently shares the popular notion that Quaker virtues are mainly negative in character. The general assumption is that the Quaker refrains from evil in his own life and then when evil assails him from without he must let it roll over him without resistance or complaint. That is only the dry, withered husks of dogmatic Quakerism. The true Quaker claims little merit for his negative virtues. He always tries to be positive. "Cease to do evil" is not a call to virtue: it only clears the way for virtue. "Learn to do well," that is virtue.

Merely refusing to fight accomplishes little. Doing all in one's power to remove the causes for fighting may accomplish much. The true Quaker lays all stress upon this positive attitude—upon preventive measures. When he faces an issue in which he must choose between fighting or dying, he knows that he has been defeated. What he does then is of small importance in comparison with what he has attempted to do, if he has been true to his trust. If he chooses death, he knows that he is not choosing the good; he is choosing between two terrible evils, and it may not be the lesser. If he chooses death it is probably in the forlorn hope that in the husks of defeat may be lurking some kernel of truth that will grow into positive virtue or achievement in the future. The only real victory would lie in preventing the issue from reaching the terrible choice between suffering violence or resorting to violence.

Doctor Holmes seems to regard it as a kind of treason for one to change his convictions and his course of action when war replaces peace. I should say that the reverse is nearer true. The fact that war exists is proof positive that peacetime thoughts and actions have failed. A radical, all-round change is demanded to meet the new situation.

A war crisis in a nation is much like a fire crisis in a family, and the two demand similar action. The householder is bound to take all the precautions that he can to avert an outbreak of fire. If the outbreak comes, he knows that his preventive measures have failed. Instead of feeling bound to lie still and be burned up out of loyalty to his previous action, he is bound to change his course radically and with precipitation, in order to salvage what he can.

The pacifist—and every other good citizen for that matter—is bound to do everything that he can to avert war. It is what he does in peacetime to prevent war that is the real test of his pacifism. If war comes, in spite of his efforts, he has failed, and what he does then is of small moment. He is no more bound to permit the flames of war to sweep over him and consume him, out of loyalty to his previous principles, than the householder is bound to lie still in his bed when fire comes. Rather is he bound to abandon his peacetime precautions with precipitation, even to the point of seizing weapons and helping beat down those who are adding fuel to the flames, in order to salvage what can be saved from the general conflagration. He is justified in doing things in the war crisis that he would never dream of doing in peacetime.

When a person's convictions harden into dogma he has abandoned all thinking so far as that subject is concerned. His only guide is blind obedience to his dogma at any cost. "His not to reason why, his but to do and die." Because the Quakers permitted their testimony against war to harden into an inelastic dogma of nonresistance is no reason why they must forever remain the victims of that dogma. Those Quakers who are "supporting this war" are not necessarily less fervently devoted to pacifism than before. The probability is that their hatred of war has become so intense that they can no longer follow the blind, negative, nonresistant course that their dogma demands. They feel impelled to follow the more dynamic course that reason and intelligence tell them will more quicky reduce the ravages of war and be most likely to prevent its recurrence.

I am a more passionate pacifist today than I ever was. My hatred of war, as the summation of all evils, mounts so high that I am willing to change my mind a dozen times; to change my conduct any number of times, and damn consistency; to throw over all of my precious prejudices if possible; and to resort to any kind of humiliating compromise if it will permanently further the cause of pacifism only a little. In so doing I would not be abandoning pacifism but would be trying to follow its demands more effectively. In case of a forest fire I would deliberately burn part of the forest rather than let it all be consumed. In order to prevent a world war I would be willing to start a local war, such as stopping the Japanese in Manchuria or the Italians in Ethiopia. Saving humanity from a world war would be far more imperative than saving my own conscience or even my own soul, to say nothing of saving an outgrown dogma.

Doctor Holmes' unkindest cut is in his implication that Quakers are deserting their dogmas from lack of courage. It may be so in some cases, but it may be an example of the finest courage in many others. It often takes more courage to abandon a dogma than to stand by it.

I always resented Theodore Roosevelt's implication that Quakers refused to fight because of cowardice.

We all know that it may take a higher type of courage to refuse to fight than to fight. Our conscientious objectors are the bravest of the brave. All honor to their courageous fortitude. I am not assailing them or criticizing them in any way. But, it may, in some situations, take as much courage *to refuse not to refuse* to fight. Perhaps many of the Quakers who are "supporting this war" illustrate that kind of courage. It is sometimes easier to throw oneself into a cause with fanatical fury and be immolated than to pursue an apparently safe and sane course that is more effective.

"So he died for his faith. That is fine—
More than most of us do.
But say, can you add to that line
That he lived for it, too?"

Correspondence

Ethical Culture Emphasis

To UNITY:

In his stimulating "Confessions" in the November issue of UNITY, Dr. E. Stanton Hodgin refers to the Ethical Culture Movement in terms which probably have not passed unnoticed and which, accordingly, I cannot allow to pass unprotested. Doctor Hodgin's reference to the dynamic nature of the Movement *some years ago* and his allegation that it subsequently became "almost reactionary" are certainly surprising to those of us who now work in the Movement. To be sure, he places us in good company by immediately declaring that many Unitarians "have become still more reactionary"; but that is doubtful comfort for either group.

No doubt Doctor Hodgin has lost touch with the platform and the works of the Ethical Culture Movement in these recent years. Were this not the case, he would know that the Leaders and membership in the various Societies have been actively identified with some of the chief liberal movements of their communities. Surely our identification with the Conference on the Scientific Spirit and Democratic Faith, with various projects to improve interracial relations, and especially the City Wide Citizens Committee on Harlem in New York, with the Work Camp movement on both the high school and college level, with progressive education for children in the Ethical Culture Schools and adults in the John L. Elliott Institute of Human Relations, and our increasing usage of the radio for democratic ethical education in terms of contemporary issues, are evidences of a liberal and forward-looking spirit. These are, I think it is safe to say, only illustrations of the activities covering a wide sector of contemporary life.

Of course, Doctor Hodgin rests his charge of reaction on the contention that those of us in the Ethical Movement regard Felix Adler as having "delivered the final message," with those of us who have followed him in the leadership of the various Societies "becoming defenders of the faith once for all enunciated by their great leader." Nothing could be less true nor more unjust either to the spirit of Adler or to the efforts of my colleagues and myself. On metaphysical grounds, there is a great diversity of views ranging from developments of Adler's own transcendentalism all the way to experimental naturalism. What is common to our point of view is the belief that concern with human relations in this world is central to a religious view of life; coupled with the belief that the mutual furtherance of human possibilities is the basic ethical guiding principle. Further, just as there is no blind defense of Adler on metaphysical questions, so there has been important development with regard to basic social, economic, political, and other matters.

To those of us who are intent upon working with liberals of varying religious and philosophic backgrounds, it is important that our efforts not be undermined by a misunderstanding of what we are and what we do.

JEROME NATHANSON.

New York City, New York.

Allinson Replies to Yarros

To UNITY:

"What terms of peace," asked Mr. Victor Yarros to our astonishment, in the September issue of UNITY, "are they [i.e., pacifists and Quakers] prepared to propose to, or accept from, Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini's successor in Italy? Why not give us an outline to ponder? Failure to do so is confession of bankruptcy. Unconditional surrender is the only possible demand that decent and humane people capable of clear thinking have to make to brutes, apemen . . . whom we must crush. . . ."

If Mr. Yarros has not choked his capacity for clear thinking by his evident rage at the pitiless performance of the leaders of the European rebellion against the dictated terms of the Versailles Treaty, following the unconditional surrender of the Kaiser and his successors, in 1918, perhaps he might begin his re-education in the realities and higher potentialities of democratic statesmanship, for want of which the "civilized" Western nations are slowly burning civilization to a crisp and strangling to death in the nightmare of collective suicide. He might do so by re-reading, for example, and pondering the elevating spirit and content of the great address to the United States Senate of President Woodrow Wilson, containing the Fourteen Points known to history in their breach rather than their fulfillment by the Allied Governments of Great Britain and France and Italy, which had formally accepted them as the essential conditions of the Armistice of November 11, 1918, and the just basis of the enduring peace that was to be. The world—and particularly the world of the Central European peoples who submitted unconditionally to the persuasive justice of those high-sounding stipulations—tasted then the fruits of that peace and found them bitter as Dead Sea fruit; indeed, so bitter that even the American Senate and people could not stomach them and would not enforce their terms through the instrumentality of the League of Nations, or otherwise.

Unconditional surrender and sinister silence concerning the future conditions of life and government in Europe were certainly very far from the liberating mind of the then inspired American President, who knew what Mr. Yarros and many others apparently have forgotten, that brave ideas of justice and collaborative reconstruction are weapons for the victories of peace as well as war; that they lie, indeed, so close to the heart of any successful strategy of peace among civilized nations as to be absolutely indispensable; and that the prolongation of an inconclusive, a deadlocked, a pitiless, if not a hopeless and miscalculated, war, which is a total tragedy, for obscure and increasingly imperialistic ends, is a consummation devoutly to be deplored and a historic monument of intellectual bankruptcy and moral infamy.

If the prestige of Woodrow Wilson is not sufficient to arouse in the mind of Mr. Yarros a respect for the unexplored possibilities of rational statesmanship and an intelligible plan for an international administration of the world's strategic straits, canals, and airways and for an emancipated and integrated Confederation of Europe as the essential means of winning either the war or the peace, there can be little use in argument with a mind that is closed to truth and charity alike. Perhaps the spirit of Jeffersonian Americanism may appeal to the original rationalist if not to the present belligerent who pins his sinking hope to the sword of vengeance and self-righteousness.

Wrote Jefferson, while Secretary of State under Washington, to Elbridge Gerry, in 1797: "I abhor war, and view it as the greatest scourge of mankind." To Tench Coxe he wrote in 1794: "I love peace and am anxious that we should give the world still another useful lesson by showing to them other modes of punishing injuries than by war, which is as much a punishment to the punisher as to the sufferer." To General Thaddeus Kosciusko, in 1811, after leaving the White House, he wrote:

> However we may have been reproached for pursuing our Quaker system, time will affix the stamp of wisdom upon it, and the happiness and prosperity of our citizens will attest its merit. And this, I believe, is the only legitimate object of Government, and the first duty of governors, and not the slaughter of men and devastation of the countries placed under their care, in pursuit of a fantastic honor, unallied to virtue and happiness; or in gratification of the angry passions or the pride of administrators, excited by personal incidents, in which their citizens have no concern.

And in the same year he wrote to J. W. Eppes:

I am so far from believing that our reputation will be tarnished by our not having mixed in the mad contests of the rest of the world that, setting aside the ravings of pepper-pot politicians, of whom there are enough in every age and country, I believe it will place us high in the scale of wisdom, to have preserved our country tranquil and prosperous during a contest which prostrated the honor, power, independence, laws, and property of every country on the other side of the Atlantic. Which of them have better preserved their honor? Has Spain, has Portugal, Italy, Holland, Prussia, Austria, the other German powers, Sweden, Denmark, or even Russia? And would we accept of the infamy of France or England in exchange for our honest reputation, or of the result of their enormities—despotism to the one, bankruptcy and prostration to the other—in exchange for the prosperity, the freedom and independence, which we have preserved safely through the wreck? . . . .

Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none . . . I deem . . . the essential principles of our Government . . . which ought to shape its administration.

If this traditional concern for *freedom from war* for America and the preservation of a rational, democratic way of life, opposing a mischievous missionary zeal for carrying "the white man's burden" of empire, or even "the four freedoms" of current propaganda to the ends of the earth, by fire and sword, is deemed isolationism, rather than continental prudence and fundamental Americanism—make the most of it! We most earnestly hope that Jefferson's latest and distinguished successor in the White House has not assumed office for a third, and will not venture to seek a fourth, term of high authority in order to preside over the liquidation of the American Republic, or its unholy matrimony, without benefit of Constitution or ceremony, to the unreconstructed British Empire and the insatiable Soviet Bear! We tremble, however, as we survey the future of our inheritance and our country, beset as it is with merciless war on a dozen fronts abroad, in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe, and misled by false counsels at home, spearheaded by the unrealistic Anglophilism of Mr. Walter Lippmann and the unabashed interventionism of his neo-imperialistic disciples, of whom Mr. Yarros is evidently one. Who is wise enough or disinterested enough to dictate peace to the groaning earth?

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Ravinia, Illinois.

Moral Relativity and Realism

TO UNITY:

Without abusing the hospitality of UNITY, may I comment briefly on two items in its November issue—the letter of Arthur D. Weage, which charges me with hiding, belittling, and coddling our home-grown Fascists and Nazis, and Doctor Holmes' enthusiastic approval of the alleged resumption by Congress of its constitutional functions and its laudable courage in opposing the Executive.

As to the first item. I am not a Chauvinist, and do not particularly like the word "patriotism." I simply try to consider facts and situations soberly and realistically, to preserve a sense of proportion. I repeat what I said about the American spirit and attitude as compared with Nazi-Fascist behavior and philosophy. We have our faults, and some of them are serious enough. We have the disfranchisement of millions of Negroes by poll taxes, by other immoral devices. We have anti-Semites who poison the minds of hosts of ignorant and gullible persons. We have reactionary employers and racketeers—and so on. But we are *fighting* all these evils, and we are making progress all along the line. Consider the condition of the Negroes today and contrast it with that of half a century ago. We have not, as a people, repudiated our ideals and principles. We have no pseudo-scientific schools which glorify brutality and inhumanity. What American thinker of note or influence shares the fallacies of Rosenberg or Mussolini?

The lynching evil is almost a thing of the past. We have had no pogroms and we have not shot or tortured prisoners of war. Our treatment of the Japs suspected of disloyalty has been humane. We have economic royalists, to be sure, but our labor movement is secure and vital, and there is plenty of militant and genuine liberalism in our churches and colleges. How, pray, can a reasonable person speak in the same breath of our shortcomings and the shocking deeds and practices of the "degenerate barbarians" of the Nazi-Fascist parties?

The worst in this country is better than the best in Nazism, someone has said, and I heartily endorse this judgment.

Doctor Holmes, apparently, lives in a dream world. The majority in Congress is *not* asserting its constitutional powers. It is fighting Roosevelt and liquidating the New Deal reforms. It is obeying selfish pressure groups and paid lobbyists, not serving the people or promoting the national welfare. On the sordid and reckless actions of the congressional majority in connection with taxation, post-war planning, limited subsidies designed to prevent ruinous inflation, popular education in the poorer states, the record of the majority in Congress is disgraceful. Doctor Holmes' rejoicing is woefully misdirected. Let him read the vigorous, candid comments of *The New Republic* and *The Nation* on the situation in Congress; in these he will find the sentiments of 90 per cent of enlightened American liberals and progressives.

VICTOR S. YARROS.

La Jolla, California.

Vision Needed

TO UNITY:

The whole world is going to pieces! And no one knows what to do! Oh, if some great and good man or woman could get a "glint from Heaven" and set all things right! I fully believe that most of the race of men and women would give all in their power to know the right thing to do in order to stop all this hell that is ruining the development of Humanity. We stand as though hypnotized. Millions of human beings, not responsible, are falling—dying. Can't God help us? We must try to do it ourselves.

It now seems that the worst condition ever known on this earth is ruining all culture, all beauty, all love for the human race. "What is to be done?" is the question. It does not seem that we can sink lower. In our Swedish *Reader's Digest* for October, the first article is: "Germany Must Be Saved." If there should come chaos in Germany the result would be disastrous. There are thousands of Germans who do not believe as the Nazis. Germany must be rebuilt, I firmly believe. What is coming? *"When* can the world begin to be optimistic?" is the question. The entire world is praying for peace. It must and will come soon.

Think of the rebuilding of all the Nations! Where are the men and women who will do it? Think of the vision needed.

RUTH RANDALL EDSTROM.

Stockholm, Sweden.

Need for a Popular Liberal Program

TO UNITY:

Usually the liberal intellectual churches of America confine their discourses and persuasions strictly to those who desire to enter their church doors. There is little effort made to do any kind of Salvation Army stunts. There is food for thought in thinking that as an experiment such means might be tried, for there are abundant ways of having an interesting and exciting program about the intellectual's views on God, man, and life.

The stirring "hit" music of the Salvation Army is an aid to them. Their emotional appeal is good. Their efforts at persuasion are effective. None of this is ever tried by the intellectual churches because they think it just does not fit their nature. Yet they continually extol the beauty of the Divine, the splendor of nature, and the revelation of God that is in it. All this could be worked out into a popular program that might make an impression somewhere in our land where there are 62 millions who go to no church at all and who probably might even wish to know something of what the intellectual churches have to offer if it were done in a popular vein.

The Unitarian or liberal minister who could do this has not yet appeared, for most devote all their energy to becoming more erudite or more sure of the theological position. The popular Doctor Bradley is something of a new departure but he has not many duplicates and neither is there any systematic effort along this line. Little wonder that there is no popular side to the liberal churches, as there might be if some creator of vision were to come.

Spectacular plays or spectacles, morality plays, all might be part of an experimental campaign to bring the intellectual churches of America more prominently into the public eye.

Questions might be asked whether such programs would be justified. Obviously they are if our beliefs are of a fine caliber and constructive in living a good life. And we do believe we have secured much inspiration and vision from our intellectual interpretations of life.

CARL PETERSON.

Chicago, Illinois.